



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sir Arthur Evans next remarks (403) that "Crete of four thousand years ago must unquestionably be regarded as the birth-place of our European civilization in its higher form". But, he adds, "are we appreciably nearer to the fountain-head?"

He then considers in detail the archaeological discoveries made in recent years in Southwestern Europe. These discoveries definitely prove a high level of artistic attainment in Southwestern Europe, "at a modest estimate some ten thousand years earlier than the most ancient monuments of Egypt or Chaldaea!" There is no space, however, to follow him through his discussion of this matter, or in his discussion of the culture of the Reindeer Age, further than to make the following quotation (405):

For the first time, moreover, we find the productions of his (= man's) art rich in human subjects. At Cogul the sacral dance is performed by women clad from the waist downwards in well-cut gowns, while in a rock-shelter of Alpera, where we meet with the same skirted ladies, their dress is supplemented by flying sashes. On the rock painting of the Cueva de la Vieja, near the same place, women are seen with still longer gowns rising to their bosoms. We are already a long way from Eve!

It is this great Alpera fresco which, among all those discovered, has afforded most new elements. Here are depicted whole scenes of the chase in which bowmen—up to the time of these last discoveries unknown among Palaeolithic representations—take a leading part, though they had not as yet the use of quivers. Some are dancing in the attitude of the Australian Corroborees. Several wear plumed headdresses, and the attitudes at times are extraordinarily animated. What is specially remarkable is that some of the groups of these Spanish-rock paintings show dogs or jackals accompanying the hunters, so that the process of domesticating animals had already begun. Hafted axes are depicted as well as cunningly shaped throwing sticks.

Sir Arthur Evans passes on to say that this type of culture is now seen to have been very wide-spread. It held sway, for example, in Poland, in a large part of Russia, in Bohemia, along the upper course of the Danube and of the Rhine, and all the way to Southwestern Britain and Southeastern Spain. Again we must quote (405):

Beyond the Mediterranean, moreover, it fits on under varying conditions to a parallel form of culture, the remains of which are by no means confined to the Cis-Saharan zone, where incised figures occur of animals like the long-horned buffalo (*Bulbalus antiquus*) and others long extinct in that region. This southern branch may eventually be found to have a large extension. The nearest parallels to the finer class of rock-carvings as seen in the Dordogne are, in fact, to be found among the more ancient specimens of similar work in South Africa, while the rock-paintings of Spain find their best analogies among the Bushmen.

Of particular interest is the demonstration, on pages 406-407, that the culture of the Reindeer Age cannot be regarded as the property of a single race.

c. k.

(To be concluded)

AN OBVIOUS MEANS OF INCREASING THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS

Some of you are weary of lamentations over the alleged decline of classical studies. I agree with you, and I assure you that there are no lamentations in this paper. Still more of you are weary of new methods of teaching the Classics; the chance of finding a serviceable method that is still new to the profession as a whole is very slight. I have no new method to suggest.

Nevertheless I am convinced that we have fewer students of the Classics than we ought to have, fewer than we might easily have, and that we teachers of the Classics are chiefly responsible. Usually a student's attitude toward the Classics and the amount of time he will devote to classical study are determined by impressions gained from the first classical language to be studied. In particular the question whether or not he shall study the other classical tongue, if such a question is raised at all, is inevitably decided largely on the basis of the language and literature with which he has already been working. The amount of study that is now being devoted to the Classics must depend, to a considerable extent, upon the question whether boys and girls are attracted by the first classical literature that is put before them. There is no doubt that they are so attracted. Cicero's eloquence and Vergil's sublime poetry have always won students for the later parts of the Latin course and for Greek. My thesis, however, is that Greek has more drawing power than Latin, and that we cannot get and keep as many students as we should have until we teach Greek to every student who comes to us at all.

I need not prove to you the superiority of Greek literature to Latin literature. Most of you who teach Latin would have chosen to teach Greek if the choice had been yours. Of greater moment for our immediate purpose is the fact that educated people in general have more respect for Greek than for Latin literature. In support of this assertion I wish to cite two witnesses. When it was proposed recently to abolish the requirement of a year's Latin in Columbia College, a teacher of a modern language, who has always been known as a friend of the Classics, announced that he would not oppose the change, because, he said, a year of Latin could give very little knowledge of Hellenic culture; and he considered Hellenism to be the part of ancient civilization a knowledge of which is vitally important.

My second witness is Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, who, on November 16, 1916 refreshed himself from the labors of the presidential campaign by addressing the American Academy and the National Institute of Arts and Sciences. In the course of his remarks, which ranged over many literatures ancient and modern, he had some very harsh things to say about Latin literature. Later in the evening he praised Greek literature and especially Homer; "I prefer", he said,

"even a dozen lines of the Greek epic to all but a half dozen lines of the English drama *Troilus and Cressida*". I do not altogether agree with the opinions he expressed, and for that reason I have not quoted his rather sweeping condemnation of Latin literature; I cite his words merely as evidence that we may expect from such men as ex-President Roosevelt more support for the study of Greek than for the study of Latin.

But we are not now so much concerned with the tastes of mature men as with the needs and the likes of High School students; for it is in the High School that boys and girls usually decide for or against the study of the Classics.

One great difficulty with the study of English is that much of our best literature is too 'old' for boys and girls. To get the meat out of our best authors, you need to know a great deal about life, and also about the earlier writers—English, French, Italian, and classical—to whom they constantly refer. It is, of course, possible for High School students to get at the meaning of Shakespeare and Milton by means of commentaries; but the net result of such study is too often a distaste for good literature.

Now the involved, indirect, allusive character of much English literature is an inheritance from the Latin. Latin literature also is sophisticated, artificial, indirect. To find literature that is at the same time great and childlike we are, for the most part, driven back to Greek. Homer is not too 'old' for anyone who knows the meaning of life and death, and love and hate. Herodotus, the Greek dramatists, even Plato built upon the solid rock of human nature; they did not rely upon learned and literary allusions as the great Roman and English writers have usually done.

One result of the simplicity of Greek literature is its ease. Most teachers of Latin will agree that Caesar is too difficult for second year pupils; and yet there is no satisfactory substitute for Caesar. There are easier authors, it is true, but they are scarcely worth reading. In Greek there is no such difficulty; the *Anabasis* is as much easier than the *Commentaries* as it is more interesting and more vital. In still greater degree Homer is easier than Vergil, and Plato than Cicero.

But, some will reply, the simple, easy style of certain Greek writers is more than counterbalanced by the difficulty of the Greek language itself. The truth of the matter is that Greek is no more difficult than Latin. There is nothing in Greek syntax that will compare in difficulty with the Latin characteristic and temporal clauses, nothing so confusing as the numerous and inconsistent meanings of the Latin ablative and the Latin subjunctive. It must be admitted that a Greek vocabulary is harder to acquire than a Latin vocabulary, and consequently it is impossible to maintain that Greek is on the whole an easier language than Latin. But neither is it more difficult than Latin. The simple style of the Greek

writers does, then, really make the study of Greek literature easier than the study of Latin literature.

Still more important is the fact that the spirit of the Greek writers is, as a rule, more in harmony with modern ideals than is that of the Romans. Caesar's frank militarism has long been repellent and will, we may hope, be still more so in the future. I grant that Xenophon's ethics were little if any superior, but, at any rate, the Ten Thousand did not clamp the yoke of a foreign power upon the necks of a weaker nation. Every teacher of Vergil knows that students are puzzled by Aeneas's tearfulness and shocked by his treatment of Dido. Cicero's braggadocio is tolerated by young America only on the ground that a man who lived so long ago probably did not know any better. These difficulties, except for the first named, are superficial; Cicero, instead of being a mere braggart, is rather to be considered a statesman of the first rank, probably the most influential of all writers of prose in the world's history, and a wonderfully sympathetic and human man, while it is only the immature reader who can find effeminacy and fickleness in Vergil's hero. Nevertheless young people do find these difficulties in appreciating High School Latin. I do not know of any such barriers in the way of appreciating Homer or Plato's *Apology*.

There is nothing novel about the observations I have been making. The superiority and the superior attractiveness of Greek have always been recognized. The contention has been that both languages should be studied by all persons of intelligence, and if a boy or girl is to study Greek in the end there is no harm in his studying Latin first. As long as classical study had control of the Schools, there was less harm in acting on this theory, although even then many a boy missed the enthusiasm for ancient literature that he might have had if he had read Homer before Caesar and Cicero.

Now the situation is different. The professions of law, medicine, and engineering require a long technical preparation, and young persons of moderate means must begin the process early. There are, besides, many subjects, such as history, sociology, physical science, of which children are now given a taste before they leave the Grammar School, subjects which appeal to the best there is in them and which they rightly wish to pursue further. Under these circumstances all but a very few young people are convinced that they have time for only one classical language at most. If we wish to hold as many of them as possible we have got to give them the most attractive material we have, namely Greek.

If we do this, we may reasonably expect in the end to increase the study of Latin also. For the whole classical field is really one. It is easier to understand Greek literature without Latin than to understand Latin literature without Greek—to do the latter thing is really impossible; but we may be sure that most students who become thoroughly interested in Greek will find a way to study Latin also.

A great deal of ingenuity has recently been devoted to proving that Roman civilization and the Latin language are the source of very much in our modern life. The close kinship of Rome to the modern world has been appealed to as a motive for studying Latin. The question arises whether there is a similar argument for the study of Greek. I think there is. The most valuable part of the civilization which Rome passed on to the modern world came from Greece. Is it not better to study the origin of European civilization and the period of its most rapid development than to study the first stage of the great decline which began with Rome and continued through the Middle Ages? Our world is more nearly akin to ancient Greece than to Rome or in fact to any other place and time in all history.

Then what can we do about it? I have three suggestions.

(1) The reason usually given for the elimination of Greek from the High Schools is that small classes are too expensive. I do not see any immediate way of meeting this argument in small High Schools. But in Schools with three or more sections in first year Latin it should be possible to have one of the sections begin Greek instead of Latin. This would involve no extra expense if one third of the students elected to study Greek. The success of the plan, then, would depend on the persuasive powers of the principal and the head of the classical department. I should say, however, that any teacher could persuade one student out of three to take Greek instead of Latin.

(2) Many Colleges require Latin for entrance but no Greek. Some of these allow the substitution of Greek for Latin, but others do not. As long as no students apply for entrance with Greek and without Latin, this makes little difference, except that it tends to perpetuate the present neglect of Greek in the High Schools. It is to be hoped that no College will refuse to accept entrance Greek in place of entrance Latin when it is offered. Provision for such cases should be made as soon as possible.

(3) The argument advanced above as to High School students applies equally to College freshmen. We are more likely to hold a man for classical study if we put him at Greek as soon as he enters College than if we give him an additional year of Latin. If possible we should have him study both Greek and Latin; but if a choice has to be made Greek should always be preferred. Even if a student enters College with four years of Latin and no Greek, it is better for him to begin Greek than to continue Latin for another year. If he gets a fair start with his Greek he will probably elect some Latin before he leaves College; but if he takes freshman Latin and no Greek, the chances are that he will drop classical study at the end of the freshman or, at most, the sophomore year.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

REVIEWS

A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy. By Evelyn Spring. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 28.135-224. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1917).

It is unfortunate that Miss Spring chose the present title for this essay, which was originally called *Quo Modo Aeschylus in Tragoediis Suis Res Antecedentis Exposuerit*, since the latter title is far more suggestive of the content of the work. Also, the opening sentences cause one to fear that Miss Spring does not always differentiate exposition and the development of the plot by unveiling the past. She says (135):

Exposition is that part of dramatic construction which deals with the unfolding of the plot. Every dramatist must provide sufficient elucidation of the past to render intelligible the ever-advancing action of the present. He may complete the necessary explanation in a few lines, or he may continue to enlighten his audience throughout the play, by revealing various circumstances that are antecedent to the action of the drama proper at the moment when the announcement of each is dramatically most effective.

The meaning of the first statement is rendered obscure, if not incorrect, by the fact that the phrase "unfolding of the plot" usually means the development of the plot or action; whereas exposition is the explanation, for the sake of the audience, of the events which lead to the unfolding of the plot. While the author may continue to enlighten his audience throughout the play, the revelation of "various circumstances that are antecedent to the drama proper at the moment when the announcement of each is dramatically most effective" is not necessarily exposition. If it were, the revelation that Oedipus is the murderer of Laius would be exposition, and so, likewise, would be the dénouement of most Latin comedies. This fundamental error actually results in Miss Spring doing herself an injustice. For instance, under the heading, *The Gradual Exposition of the Past*, she shows in an excellent manner the dramatic value of the gradual unveiling of the past for purposes of characterization, dramatic irony, etc. (189-199); but she calls this procedure, at times, the gradual method of exposition and distributive exposition, although she tacitly proves that it is not exposition. At other times, she recognizes the difference, for she points out that lines 227-247 of the choral ode in the *Agamemnon*, dealing with the death of Iphigenia, are not primarily expository in character, but furnish "the foundation for Clytaemnestra's later defence of her crime" (205). Thus, if the reader keeps in mind that the purpose of Miss Spring's study is to show how Aeschylus unveiled the past, and realizes that she uses the term exposition in a rather loose way, he will find many interesting pages in the essay; but the reader will be disappointed if the present title leads him to expect an account of the development of the art of exposition in relation to the point of attack in all Greek tragedy.